

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the opportunity provided to Applicants' representative to conduct a telephone interview with the Examiner and the Primary Examiner on November 5, 2003. During the interview, Applicants' representative explained the difference between the cited art and proposed amended claim 1. As explained below, proposed amended claim 1 has been added to the present application as newly added claim 14.

Claims 1-2, 5-8, and 13-14 are under consideration. Claim 14 is newly added. No new matter has been introduced therein. Claims 9-12 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishiyama et al. (JP 2000-050584). Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama in view of Mildice (U.S. Patent No. 6,252,331). Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama in view of Reiter, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,191,256).

Applicants' invention, as recited by amended claim 1, includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, for example:

... at least one of said first rotator portions being magnetically coupled with at least one of said second rotator portions in a field where said first rotator portion and said second rotator portion are in complete magnetic contact without a non-magnetic member disposed therebetween ...

This means that at least one of first rotator portions 2 of the motor recited in claim 1 is magnetically coupled with at least one of second rotator portions 3. The at least one first rotator portion 2 is magnetically coupled to the at least one second rotator portion 3 in a field where the first rotator portion 2 and the second rotator portion 3 are in complete magnetic contact. No non-magnetic member is disposed between the at least one first rotator portion 2 and the at least one second rotator portion 3. These features are disclosed in the originally filed application, for example, at page 11, line 20 through page 12, line 3; page 12, line 15 through page 13, line 2; page 27, lines 10-21; and at Figure 1. No new matter has been added.

As shown in Figure 1 of the present application, first rotator portions 2 (including permanent magnets 1) are in direct contact with second rotator portion 3 (having magnetic saliency). There is no nonmagnetic member separating first rotator portion 2 and second rotator portion 3. Thus, first rotator portion 2 and second rotator portion 3 are in complete magnetic contact.

In contrast, Nishiyama discloses nonmagnetic member 5 separating first rotator portion 2 (including permanent magnet 6) from second rotator portion 3 (See Figure 1). Nishiyama does disclose an embodiment where a partial magnetic coupling is provided between first rotor section 32 and second rotor section 33 (See Figure 8 and the accompanying description). This is accomplished by changing a thickness of nonmagnetic member 31. Thus, although some level of magnetic coupling may be established between first rotor section 32 and second rotor section 33, this magnetic coupling is substantially limited by nonmagnetic member 31. This coupling is not a complete magnetic coupling as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

As such, Nishiyama teaches a very different configuration from that recited by claim 1 of the present application. Neither Mildice nor Reiter, Jr. makes up for the deficiencies of Nishiyama, and as such, even by combining Nishiyama with either of Mildice and Reiter, Jr., Applicants' claimed motor is not achieved.

It is because Applicants include the above-recited structure of claim 1, that the following advantages are achieved. A motor with reduced mechanical loss that efficiently generates magnetic torque, without a nonmagnetic member, is provided.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record. Claims 2, 5-8, and 13 include all of the features of claim 1 from which they depend, either directly or indirectly. Thus, claims 2, 5-8, and 13 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

As provided above, newly added claim 14 includes all of the features of proposed amended claim 1 discussed during the telephone interview of November 5, 2003. As indicated in the Interview Summary, the Examiner provided that pending a further search, "[i]t appears that the proposed amendment will overcome the art


Application No.: 09/863,131  
Amendment Dated: January 13, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of: October 14, 2003

MTS-3252US

rejection." Thus, absent a more relevant reference being located during the further search, claim 14 is patentable over the art of record.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Allan Ratner, Reg. No. 19,717  
Christopher M. Spletzer, Reg. No. 52,240  
Attorneys for Applicants

CMS/fp

Dated: January 13, 2004

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980  
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

January 13, 2004



---